

especially from staff members Arlee May, Linda Victor, and Martha Fishel.

REFERENCES

1. Bell CL. A SERLINE-based union list of serials for basic health science libraries: a detailed protocol. *Bull Med Libr Assoc* 1982 Oct;70(4):308-8.
2. National Library of Medicine, Serials Record Section. Format for transmission of holdings data to the NLM National Biomedical Serials Holdings Data Base. Bethesda, Md: National Library of Medicine, 1982.

Production of a Union List of Serials Using the PHILSOM Serials System

BY WAYNE J. PEAY, *Head, Media Services and
Technical Services*

KAREN A. BUTTER, *Head, Public Services*

SANDRA ELLIS, *Serials Supervisor*
Spencer S. Eccles Health Sciences Library
University of Utah
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112

THE UTAH HEALTH Sciences Library Consortium (UHSL) consists of fourteen libraries. Member libraries are distributed along 150 miles of the western slope of the Wasatch Mountains, with a majority of the libraries and the resources located in Salt Lake City. Collections range in size from fewer than 1,000 volumes to more than 120,000 volumes at the Spencer S. Eccles Health Sciences Library at the University of Utah. The Eccles Library has used the PHILSOM serials control system since 1969, when it was the first library to join the PHILSOM Network. The PHILSOM system is a comprehensive, automated serials control system, developed and operated as a network by the Washington University School of Medicine Library. Begun as a batch system, it was upgraded to offer online records maintenance in 1978. Currently, twenty-one health sciences libraries located throughout the country participate in the PHILSOM Network. In 1981, the Midcontinental Regional Medical Library Program, located at the McGoogan Library of Medicine at the University of Nebraska Medical Center, contracted with Washington University to develop an online interlibrary loan system based on the PHILSOM system. The result was OCTANET, which takes requests

entered into the PHILSOM system and automatically routes them to the resource libraries that have the volume and issue. The system provides the lending library with all information required to complete the loan [1]. As part of the contract, Washington University developed a subsystem that combined the OCTANET telecommunications configuration and the PHILSOM serials system to provide the capability of producing local union lists for the nonresource libraries in the region. This subsystem was refined as a result of the efforts of St. Louis medical libraries that began their work on a union list in 1982.

PRODUCTION

The production of an automated union list of serials had been discussed a number of times by the UHSL consortium, but there was never a real stimulus for action. At the October 1982 meeting of the MLA Midcontinental Chapter, a system for producing union lists was presented, based upon the remote data entry capability that the OCTANET system provides. The data were to be added to the PHILSOM network database and then extracted to produce the union list in the specified format. This was a significant advantage, because the union list would use the bibliographic information from some 14,000 titles that had been collected over the years by the PHILSOM Network.

Nine members of the consortium agreed to participate. Using the Eccles Health Sciences Library serials location desk copy, the libraries were asked to annotate their holdings for the titles that they could identify as being in the list. This approach had several advantages. First, the location desk copy provided enough bibliographic information for the libraries to identify their notations. For the titles they could not find in the location desk copy, they were asked to provide photocopies of the title page or masthead for the oldest issue and for the most recent issue of the title in their collection with their holdings. Finally, the participating libraries were asked to have their work completed in three weeks, so there would be enough time to enter the data before the January 1 deadline.

Record entry was a straightforward process that was also facilitated through the use of the location desk copy, as it includes a unique identification number for each title. Using a CRT, a 1,200-baud modem, and printer, all of the data was input into the database at Washington University from the Eccles Health Sciences Library in Salt Lake City. The input process, for those titles that were anno-

tated on the location desk copy, was simply a matter of calling up the appropriate record by using the identification number, and then adding the holdings for the library. The title keyword and ISSN search capabilities of the system were used to identify the records for those titles not found on the location desk copy. Finally, the system is capable of producing, on demand, a complete list of each library's holdings. This list was used to edit the input and will be the basis for future updates of the union list.

By January 1, the input of data for eight libraries had been completed. Twenty-five printed copies of the union list were delivered on March 24. Although the deadline did slip, the project was completed in fewer than four months. This is the first union list that has been completed using the OCTANET union list subsystem.

CONCLUSION

A useful byproduct of the PHILSOM system is the accurate records that are generated. These records make it possible to calculate the production costs for the union list. In its final form, the union list consisted of 1,852 holdings records, for the 918 titles held by the eight participating libraries. To enter the holdings records, it required 38.7 hours of connect time at an average rate of one record completed every 1.25 minutes. An additional 2.6 hours of connect time was required to edit the data. The average cost for the connect time, assuming it was not subsidized, was \$8.80 per hour. The cost of inputting and editing a title was 20¢. It should be noted that the connect time charge does vary in direct proportion to the distance from the computer. Because this is an ongoing project, there is an annual storage charge of 24¢ for each title. As a result, the total cost for inputting, editing, and storing the records for this project was 44¢ per title.

Finally, the costs of actual production of the union list included a fixed charge of \$75.00 to produce the magnetic tape required to produce either the microform copy or print copy. The UHSL union list was produced in a print format at a cost of 3¢ per page, for a cost of \$2.64 per copy. Assuming that the participating libraries had only produced eight copies, the total cost per title for this project would have been 49¢. Although this figure obviously does not include the personnel time that was invested in this project, it does provide a benchmark for libraries to use in estimating the costs of using this system.

REFERENCES

1. Pride D. The view from here. *Octasphere Suppl* 1981 June; S1-S3.

A Regional Union List as an Online Catalog for Consumer Health Information

BY STUART J. KOLNER, *Branch Librarian*

*Library of the Health Sciences
University of Illinois
College of Medicine
Rockford, Illinois 61107*

THE RISE of consumerism, the popularization of health-related publications, and the success of consumer health information projects around the country have prompted many libraries to expand traditionally professional collections and services to embrace the health-care consumer as a primary user.

Many medical center and hospital libraries contain a significant number of lay-oriented materials; however, such materials are usually classified with professional literature on the same topic, with no distinction made as to intended audience. While reference and search services can provide an effective interface between the uninitiated consumer and the technical literature, it is often useful to be able to identify lay-oriented items for inclusion in a bibliography or for the establishment of a separate consumer browsing collection.

The National Library of Medicine subject authority scheme does include several tags describing the intended audience, the principal one being the form subheading **POPULAR WORKS**. Therefore, to identify most lay materials in a clinical collection, it is necessary only to locate all occurrences of **POPULAR WORKS** in the catalog.

Unfortunately, the card catalog is not equal to this task. Such a search would require either a subject-by-subject examination of the subject catalog or a card-by-card hunt through the shelf list. The labor required precludes such a task in a large collection. An automated short-record catalog, such as many online circulation systems use, is also useless; the form subheading is not part of the unit record. Full record circulation systems and online public catalogs are expensive, and are therefore not widely available.

Region VII (Region III, beginning 1983) is fortunate in having under development a machine-